

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

At the outset, the Applicants wish to thank the examiners for the courtesy shown to their representatives during a personal interview on June 30, 2010. The participants were Examiner Andrew Lee, SPE Phirin Sam, Takashi Ishihara, and the undersigned. The issues and claims discussed were the rejection of claims 11, 12, 13 and 14 under 35 USC §102(e), as being anticipated by Toskala et al. (US 6,917,602). A summary of the substance of the interview is included in the comments below.

Agreement was reached during the interview in that the examiners agreed that the presently applied prior art reference (Toskala et al. (US 6,917,602)) does not teach or suggest the instant claimed subject matter of claims 11, 12, 14 and 15, and that further searching would be needed before issuance of a notice of allowance. Claims 11, and 13 are amended solely for clarity, as discussed during the interview. Claim 15 is amended to be in independent form, to delete the feature "at random," and to emphasize that the access signals are continuously transmitted in at least two consecutive time slots. New independent claim 16 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 15.

During the interview, it was noted that Toskala (US 6,917,602) discloses a method for RACH capture to establish a connection between a transmitting UE and a receiving Node B. During the preamble transmission mode, the UE transmits a plurality of successively increasing power level time-spaced access preambles. The number of preambles that are transmitted at increasing power levels is determined from the RACH transmission control parameter sent from

the RRC. When a preamble of sufficient power is received, an acquisition indicator (AI) signal generated at Node B is sent to the UE which then terminates transmission of any further access preambles. During the message part transmission mode, the UE, upon receipt of the AI, sends to the Node B a RACH message having an embedded collision detection preamble (CDP). If the RACH message from the UE is not correctly decoded (or a collision occurs with other UE's using the same RACH time slot), the Node B generates a collision detection indication (CDI) signal matching the CDP of the UE whose RACH message is not correctly decoded. The UE retransmits the RACH message in response to receiving the CDI signal generated at the receiving Node B. Toskala discloses, upon detection of a collision, providing for additional retransmissions of the RACH message with either the number of retransmissions specified or a time interval within which the retransmissions occur, dependent upon the exact specification determined.

It was noted that in Toskala's preamble transmission mode, there is no receipt, from the base station, of information relating to a number of transmissions, nor is there any transmission, using a resource selected at random from resource candidates, of the same number of access signals, as the number of transmission signals to which the information relates.

It was further noted that in Toskala's message part transmission mode, the UE does not transmit "access signals." The message part transmission mode begins after Node B's transmission of an AI (acknowledgment indication) and the UE's transmission of a RACH message (including a CDP (collision detection preamble)). When decoding of the RACH message from the UE fails, Node B sends a CDI (collision detection indicator); and when the CDP matches with CDI, the UE retransmits the RACH message. Each of the RACH messages is transmitted in a different instance. AI is only an acknowledge signal not related to the number of

any transmission signals. CDI is an identifier for UE not related to the number of any transmission signals. If CDI matches with CDP, the UE retransmits RACH messages but the number of RACH messages is not identified by the CDI.

Given the above points, it was agreed during the interview that, in Taskala, none of the signals transmitted by the Node B in the message part transmission mode is comparable to "information which relates to a number of transmission signals" as in Applicants' claim 11, nor are these signals used in any manner during the preamble transmission mode. It was further agreed that claim 11 distinguishes over Taskala in that Taskala fails to disclose a base station that transmits information which relates to a number of transmission signals or a terminal apparatus that transmits the same number of access signals, using a resource selected at random from resource candidates, as the number of transmission signals to which base station-transmitted information relates.

Accordingly, it was agreed that Taskala does not anticipate the subject matter defined by claim 11 or claim 13.

It was further noted that, in the Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), each access signal is transmitted in a different instance; that is, an access signal is retransmitted after the first access signal results in failure to establish a communication connection. The feature of the AAPA requires an undesirably long time before communication is established. On the other hand, this disadvantage is avoided in Applicants' claim 15, wherein a plurality of access signals are transmitted continuously in at least two consecutive time slots. During the interview, it was agreed that Taskala does not disclose the above-discussed subject matter of claim 15.

Based on the above discussion, it was agreed that the present rejections are unwarranted, and the Examiners indicated that a further search would be conducted.

In light of the foregoing, a notice of allowance of claims 11 and 13 and all claims dependent therefrom is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: July 15, 2010
JEL/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-06187
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 457-0160
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559

DC 9289-6187 156512